

Certainly he was not discussing engineering problems with him. The explanation of Senator Raymond of these conversations and of his replies to Mr. Jones by merely saying no, is, at the very least unsatisfactory.

Senator Raymond sold out to Mr. Sweezy and associates in September or October of 1929 (B137), retaining or re-purchasing 351 part interests in the second syndicate.

Senator Raymond states generally that he took no part in the Company in so far as advancing the project was concerned. He certainly was in communication with the syndicate's solicitor on numerous occasions, as shown in Mr. Geoffrion's bill. (B135 and 136).

Q. Now, you had many communications and interviews with Mr. Geoffrion. I have Exhibit 114 here and I have counted up and find you had, I think, twenty telephones and communications with him—I mean by telephone or in person, you understand, in connection with Beauharnois, because it is his bill with respect to Beauharnois. I have no intention of going into this in any detail at all. Probably you cannot remember them; one's memory, perhaps, cannot do that. But I suggest them to you to show that you were taking a very active interest in the progress of Beauharnois.—A. I think I have already declared that in the spring of 1928 I was not in Canada, but I passed through and naturally I would call up Mr. Geoffrion to find out as to progress.

Q. Is that all? You see, these are again in September, 1927.—A. I was in Montreal then.

Q. And they carry on through December, three occasions; January, 1928, three occasions; January again, five occasions; February, two occasions; April, three occasions; and May, two occasions. Just a minute; I want to see whether those interviews were prior to or after the emphyteutic lease. I understood Mr. Geoffrion to say that after that he had a bill which indicated to him that he had been in communication with you. Would that be correct?—A. Yes.

Q. With respect to what?—A. With respect to the financing of the project.

Q. Did it have anything to do with the passage of the Order in Council?—A. Not at all.

Q. Nothing at all?—A. No, sir.

Q. Your position then, sir, to make it plain, is that you were simply taking no interest in that matter at all?—A. None at all.

Q. Although it was something in which you had a very, very substantial financial interest?—A. I would not call it very substantial.

Q. You mean comparatively?—A. First \$30,000, and then finally I was \$10,000 to the good. I do not call that very substantial.

Q. At one time you were committed for \$190,000, which I—forgive me—thought was rather substantial. You did have those many dollars committed to this enterprise?—A. I was responsible.

Q. And your position is that even though that was so, you were not interesting yourself to have that step taken without which there could be no success?—A. I do not see what I could do in the matter. And I was never part of the syndicate.

Q. It never appeared in your name, you mean?—A. No, I mean I was never a director, and I was never in the company.

Hon. Mr. CANNON: Never a manager.

*By Mr. Smith:*

Q. You were never a manager of the syndicate? That is what you mean?—A. Yes.